

# EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

~~~~~

IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION OPIATE LITIGATION

Case No: 1:17-md-2804-DAP

This document relates to:

All Cases

~~~~~

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION  
CONFERENCE CALL

Transcribed July 18, 2018

Veritext Legal Solutions  
1100 Superior Avenue, Suite 1820  
Cleveland, Ohio

Stephen J. DeBacco, RPR

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 inspection. I believe it was July 23rd. And  2 that they would actually make the medical  3 examiner available for a deposition the next  4 day. Obviously, that's not giving us enough  5 time to --  6 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: No, it's  7 not.  8 MS. ROITMAN: -- review the  9 records. But more importantly, that there's  10 insufficient time for them to review these  11 records. And since then, the parties have had  12 discussions about the privacy issues and the  13 position that actually federal law applies, and  14 we think that's a lot (inaudible), and that  15 these records are sufficiently protected under  16 the existing protective order.  17 In fact, Summit County produced  18 medical examiner records, you know, with those  19 protective order designations, not designated  20 as highly confidential. So just a point of  21 clarification on that, certainly our agreement  22 was not an agreement that in copy -- in-person  23 hard copy productions were sufficient to  24 satisfy Plaintiffs' discovery obligations here.  25 MALE SPEAKER: They've agreed and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 geographic scope rulings, and I've heard back  2 both formally and informally from a variety of  3 parties -- well, I should say a variety of  4 Defendants, who were unhappy with that. And of  5 course, they always have the opportunity to  6 file objections that the Court would take up.  7 What I want to say is that I'm  8 thinking about that anew -- you can call it a  9 sua sponte reconsideration if you want -- and  10 trying to figure out the extent to which I'm  11 going to leave it alone or maybe tweak it. But  12 that said, it should certainly be the case that  13 as far as the geographics go, all Defendants  14 concentrate on Ohio, that Ohio comes out first.  15 We need to get Ohio -- all the discovery that  16 is Ohio-related produced.  17 And as far as the temporal scope,  18 at the very least, when Defendants are saying,  19 "Well, we only want to go back to date X," say  20 2013, at the very least, that should be  21 produced as, you know, given that Defendants  22 are saying, "This is what we're willing to do."  23 And, you know, that's a defendant-by-defendant  24 thing, I know, and that there have been --  25 there were agreements that were reached,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 understood to that.  2 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Yes?  3 MALE SPEAKER: Just, I think we  4 all -- underneath -- we were waiting for an  5 order to come down, and your order did come  6 down last week, and -- and we now are making it  7 available. I just -- I don't think there's  8 much more to say on that, other than the fact  9 that we had an agreement and we're abiding by  10 it.  11 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Well, they  12 need to be made available as soon as possible.  13 I don't know where June 20 -- excuse me, July  14 23rd is coming, but that's two weeks from now.  15 It doesn't seem like it should take that long.  16 MALE SPEAKER: We'll reach the  17 medical examiner, try to move that up, make it  18 available in their facilities. But we'll take  19 care of that.  20 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Thank you.  21 The only other thing I want to talk  22 about today, and I do have a few others on my  23 list, but the only other one I want to talk  24 about today is, you know, I issued a discovery  25 ruling, number two, that set some temporal and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 partially.  2 Defendants need to reach back to  3 the earliest date they can, that they've agreed  4 to in writing or orally or however else with  5 the Plaintiffs, and produce that stuff in Ohio  6 as quickly as possible. And then I -- you  7 know, I'm going to -- I'm going to decide  8 whether I'm going to change that order in any  9 respect soon.  10 There's one more thing I want to  11 add --  12 MS. WELCH: Special Master Cohen,  13 this is --  14 SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Yes.  15 MS. WELCH: -- Donna Welch for  16 Allergan and the manufacturing Defendants. We  17 will be getting you something in writing on  18 that, hopefully tomorrow morning, laying out  19 from the various manufacturers' positions some  20 of the burden associated with temporal scope  21 and the expansion of the product scope. I just  22 wanted to flag that that's coming, and I think  23 it's important in the context of discussions  24 about, for example, when can you produce  25 custodial files.</p>